

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated December 5, 2007. All rejections and objections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Blackwell for his helpfulness in a telephone interview held May 28, 2008. The amendments herein are intended to reflect that discussion.

Support for the present claim amendments is found at various places in the Specification as originally filed. For example, support for replacing the custom tag with the executable instructions by the Web browser is found in lines 7-12 and 26-27 on page 8 of the Specification as originally filed. Examples of support for executable instructions for rendering a tree control include the originally filed figures 4A and 4B, and the text from line 9 on page 11 through line 22 on page 13.

No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to claim 1 for informality. Amendments to claim 1 herein are believed to meet all requirements of the Examiner in this regard.

At paragraphs 7-8 of the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-8, 10-12 and 17-20 as being obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, based on the combination of the previously cited Lennox reference with U.S. patent 6,988,240 of Grober ("Grober"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Lennox discloses client side includes in which Javascript references an outside JavaScript file that is used to write HTML into a document. Grober discloses a system for low overhead enhancement of Web page and markup language presentations. In the Grober system, attributes referred to as tags are embedded in Web pages to identify aspects of the display subject to

enhancement. Functionality referred to as a “player” is separately contained within the Grober Web pages, and operates to selectively interpret the identifying tags and to perform enhancements.

Nowhere in the combination of Lennox and Grober is there disclosed or suggested any method or system for loading a markup language document, including:

- receiving said document comprising a plurality of tags, at least one of said tags being custom tags;

- parsing said document to determine if certain of said plurality of tags are said custom tag, wherein said parsing includes scanning a document object model (DOM) representation of said document for the presence of said custom tags;

- inserting, by said Web browser executing on said client computer and prior to rendering of said document on a display device, executable instructions into said document at a location of said custom tag, if said custom tag is present, wherein said inserting includes modifying said DOM representation of said document to replace said custom tag with said executable instructions, wherein said executable instructions are for rendering a tree control display;*

- executing said executable instructions for rendering said tree control display; and

- rendering said document including said tree control display on said display device.

(emphasis added)

as in the present independent claim 1. As previously noted, Lennox discloses nothing about processing a DOM representation of a document in order to identify and/or replace a detected custom tag within the DOM with machine-executable instructions, as in the present independent claims. Grober describes a system in which Web pages themselves include a “player” for performing enhancements identified by “non-conventional” attributes or tags. Grober expressly teaches that the player provided in a Web pages monitors the enhancement identification tags. For example, Grober states as follows in this regard as follows in column 2 beginning at line 21:

Further aspects of the invention provide methods as described above in which the player is *encoded in the web page* as a script, applet or a control. The script can be, for example, a Visual Basic or JavaScript script. The applet can be a Java applet. The control can be, for example, an ActiveX control. *Regardless, a player according to related aspects of*

the invention is encoded with functionality (e.g., by way of script or programming instructions) to present the help text, graphics or other information associated with the selected markup element or referenced thereby. (emphasis added)

Grober, like Lennox, thus provides no teaching or suggestion of inserting, *by a Web browser executing on said client computer and prior to rendering of said document on a display device*, executable instructions into said document at a location of said custom tag, if said custom tag is present, *wherein said inserting includes modifying said DOM representation of said document to replace said custom tag with said executable instructions, wherein said executable instructions are for rendering a tree control display*, as in the present independent claim 1. Grober teaches a system in which the player portion of a Web page *monitors* Web page elements to modify the Web page presentation *after* the Web page is rendered, for example by highlighting displayed elements and/or generating a pop-up display. See Grober, column 2, lines 57-67. While Grober discloses that enhancing the presentation of a Web page may include some unspecified “direct modification of the DOM”, Grober states that this is not the preferable technique for such enhancements. See lines 29-43 of column 7 in Grober. Moreover, nothing in Lennox or Grober describes or suggests specifically *replacing* a custom tag in the DOM with executable instructions, far less any tag replacement in a DOM that replaces a custom tag with *executable instructions for rendering a tree control display*, as in the present independent claim 1. Applicants further respectfully urge that modifying Grober to include *replacement* of the Grober identification tags would defeat the fundamental operation of Grober, which relies on the continued *presence* of the identification tags for detection during the monitoring performed by the separately provided player functionality.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully urge that the combination of Lennox and Grober does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claim 1. Accordingly, the combination of Lennox and Grober does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103. As to dependent claims 2, 4 and 5, they each depend from independent claim 1, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over Lennox and Grober for at least the same reasons.

Independent claim 6 also stands rejected under the combination of Lennox and Grober. As should be clear from the discussion above, the combination of Lennox and Grober does not disclose or suggest inserting, by said Web browser executing on said client computer and prior to rendering of said document on a display device, said machine-executable instructions into said document at a location associated with said custom tag, wherein said inserting includes modifying said DOM representation of said document to replace said custom tag with said machine-executable instructions, wherein said executable instructions are for rendering a tree control display, as in the present independent claim 6. Applicants accordingly respectfully urge that the combination of Lennox and Grober also does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103. As to dependent claims 7-8 and 10-11, the each depend from claim 6, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Lennox and Grober for at least the same reasons. Claims 12 and 17-20 have been canceled herein.

Applicants have cancelled some claims from further consideration in this application, and have amended the independent claims. Applicants are not conceding in this application that the cancelled or unamended claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution.

Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue the cancelled or unamended claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

June 2, 2008
Date

/David Dagg/
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
44 Chapin Road
Newton, MA 02459
(617) 630-1131

Docket No. 303606.3000-100 (260-134)